DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 280 096 CS 505 538

AUTHOR Seibert, Joy Hart
TITLE Language Research across the Three Nonfunctionalist Paradigms: A Theoretical and Methodological Examination.
PUB DATE Apr 87
NOTE 51p.; Paper presented at the Joint Meeting of the Central States Speech Association and the Southern Speech Communication Association (St. Louis, MO, April 9-12, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication Research; Discourse Analysis; *Language Research; *Language Usage; *Linguistic Theory; Models; *Organizational Communication; Philosophy; *Research Methodology; Research Needs; Social Psychology

ABSTRACT

Noting that language is a powerful symbolic activity in need of attention in the organizational research realm, this paper examines language research in organizational settings across three nonfunctionalist paradigms: the interpretive, the radical humanist, and the radical structuralist. Within each paradigm, the paper discusses theoretical underpinnings, research methodologies, study findings, and implications of existing work for future research. The paper concludes that functionalist paradigms have for too long constrained research choices and stifled knowledge development, and that nonfunctionalist paradigms can help researchers to address interesting and untapped areas of organizational life. (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED280096

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Language Research Across the Three Nonfunctionalist Paradigms: A Theoretical and Methodological Examination

Joy Hart Seibert

The author is a doctoral student in the College of Communications at the University of Kentucky. Paper presented at the joint convention of the Central States Speech Association and the Southern Speech Communication Association, St. Louis, 1987.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joy Hart Seibert

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 505 538

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Language, the distinguishing characteristic between humans and other creatures, has long been at the forefront of communication research. However, organizational researchers have tended to gloss over language and focus instead on other organizational phenomena. In this paper, it is argued that language in the organizational realm is deserving of more research attention.

Although there are many ways of conceptualizing the social world, Burrell and Morgan (1979) propose four paradigms or world views. While work has been conducted in each paradigm, the vast majority of the organizational literature is functionalist in nature. The paper examines language research in organizational contexts across the three nonfunctionalist paradigms. Within discussions of the research in each paradigm, theoretical underpinnings, research methodologies, and study findings are detailed. In addition, the implications of existing research are discussed in terms of future endeavors. It is likely that our limited understanding of language in organizations will be broadened by research from each of these paradigms.

Language Research Across the Three Nonfunctionalist Paradigms: A Theoretical and Methodological Examination

The fox knows many things, but the
hedgehog knows one big thing.

Isaiah Berlin
The Hedgehog and the Fox

In his book, Paradigms in Transition, Rosnow (1981) compares the course of social psychology with the difference between the hedgehog and the fox. Rosnow (1981) argues that social psychology in general has been like a hedgehog--focused on a single dominant vision. He asserts that social psychology has been "committed to a unitary vision of science with the dogged determination of one who is possessed with a universal organizing principle of all human experience" (p.119). However, shortcomings in this dominant view have led to a call for other levels and types of inquiry. According to Rosnow (1981), social psychology must become more like the fox--"it must begin to pursue a methodological and theoretical pluralism" (p. 119). Such a pluralism is beneficial in producing different types of knowledge and also in highlighting the assumptions and prejudices embedded in any line of inquiry (Cartwright, 1973; White, 1983).

The overwhelming majority of organizational research has been conducted from a functionalist perspective (Benson, 1977; Burrell & Morgan, 1979; Clark, 1985; Conrad, 1985; Morgan, 1984; Monge, Farace, Eisenberg, Miller, & White, 1984; Putnam, 1982, 1983). However, as Rosnow (1981) argues, "we must not close our minds against other innovative theories and methods that are outside the jurisdiction of a synchronic mode of inquiry, for the disillusionment prevalent in social psychology can be exploited to stimulate the development of an array of admissible paradigms and a constructive reshaping of theoretical interstices" (p. 119). Despite the abundance of functionalist research, the perspective has been widely criticized (e.g., Fischer & Sirianni, 1984; Zey-Ferrell, 1981, 1982). For example, Lincoln (1985b) echoes Rosnow's (1981) feelings of disillusionment with the traditional paradigm. In fact, she asserts that "dissatisfaction, a quiet unease with the old solutions, the old unanswered questions, and the old and largely incomplete pictures we have formed" (p. 31) are the driving forces behind shifts in paradigms.

While there are multiple ways of dividing the social world (Astley & Van de Ven, 1983; Clark, 1985; Pfeffer, 1982; Putnam, 1982; Redding, 1979; Roberts, O'Reilly, Bretton, & Porter, 1974), Burrell and Morgan (1979) propose four paradigms or world views. These four are the functionalist, interpretive, radical humanist, and radical structuralist. Although work has been conducted in each paradigm for a number of years, it is only recently that the latter three have been discussed as appropri e avenues for organizational inquiry.

The purpose of this paper is to examine language research in organizational contexts across the three nonfunctionalist paradigms. Language, the distinguishing characteristic between humans and other creatures, is viewed as a powerful symbolic activity (Coulthard, 1977; Daft & Wiginton, 1979; Gumperz, 1972; Morgan, Frost, & Pondy, 1983) sorely in need of research attention in the organizational realm (Gronn, 1983). As Smircich (1983c) notes, "the analysis of language is important and represents an almost untapped area of investigation for the field of organization studies" (p. 171). First, language research from an interpretive perspective is addressed. Second, radical humanist examinations of language are reviewed. Third, views of radical structuralists on language use are explored. Within each paradigm, theoretical underpinnings, research methodologies, and study findings are detailed. In addition, the implications of existing research are discussed in terms of future endeavors.

The Interpretive Paradigm

Although the interpretive paradigm has historical roots (Burrell & Morgan, 1979; Deetz, 1982) (See Burrell & Morgan, 1979, for a detailed historical description), it has only recently been considered as a useful perspective for the study of organizations and organizational communication. New approaches based on the interpretive paradigm are fundamentally different than the traditional functionalist approaches to the study of organizations. Pacanowsky and O'Donnell-Trujillo (1982) characterize these recent approaches as alternatives "that will allow us to ask radically different, yet interesting, questions about organizations" (p. 117).

Theoretical Underpinnings

The four cells in Burrell and Morgan's (1979) scheme are derived from positions on two dimensions--the subjective-objective dimension and the regulation-radical change dimension (See Burrell & Morgan, 1979, for additional discussion of these dimensions). The interpretive paradigm shares a regulatory or orderly view of society with the functionalist paradigm, but differs in its beliefs about the nature of reality (Burrell & Morgan, 1979; Putnam, 1982). Thus, drastically different theoretical assumptions undergird this world view than those which have guided the majority of mainstream organizational research.

While the functionalists believe that reality exists separate from individuals and is an environmental given, proponents of the interpretive paradigm argue that reality exists subjectively. Although there are several different schools of thought within the paradigm (Burrell & Morgan, 1979; Putnam, 1982), all interpretive researchers believe that "reality is socially constructed through the subjective experiences of its members" (Putnam, 1982, p. 194). Reality is created by interpretation of events and actions and is dependent upon these events (Morgan, 1983; Putnam, 1982). Supporters of the interpretive framework view the social world as "made up of symbolic behavior sustained through human interaction" (Faules, 1982, p. 152).

As such, "the interpretive paradigm directly challenges the preoccupation with certainty that characterizes the functionalist perspective, showing that order in the social world, however real in surface appearance, rests in a precarious, socially constructed web of

symbolic relationships that are continually negotiated, renegotiated, affirmed or changed" (Morgan, 1984, p. 313). Thus, the interpretive researcher seeks to understand this web of relationships and how such relationships take place. Interest centers upon the processes by which an orderly reality is constructed and maintained (Putnam, 1982). According to Pacanowsky and O'Donnell-Trujillo (1982), the motive of interpretive researchers is best described as trying to "understand how organizational life is accomplished communicatively" (p. 121).

While several metaphors have been developed to guide interpretive thought (e.g. culture, language game, sense-making, theatre, text) (Morgan, et al., 1983; Putnam, 1982), communication is central to each. Interpretive researchers see meanings as "evolv(ing) from interaction processes and the ways that individuals make sense of their talk" (Putnam, 1983, p. 40). Process refers to an ongoing activity of creating meanings and understanding. In this view, "organizing becomes a process of communication and "communication is not simply another organizational activity" (Putnam, 1983, p. 53); it is at the base of organizing.

This focus upon communication as the process by which intersubjective realities are created and sustained obviously highlights the importance of language. Morgan, et al. (1983) assert that language is a symbolic activity through which organizational realities emerge. The theoretical underpinnings common to interpretive research lead to quite different foci than those in traditional functionalist approaches. It is not surprising that different research methods frequently are used to explore interpretive foci.

Research Methods

Because interpretive research addresses different questions and sets different foci than traditional organizational research, its methods are much unlike traditional methods (Pacanowsky & O'Donnell-Trujillo, 1982). The broadness of the interpretive perspectives allow for a good deal of divergence among methods (e.g. observation, interviews, tape-recording, etc.). Although some interpretive research employs quantitative methods, research from this framework is generally characterized as qualitative. One result of the growing acceptance of interpretive positions has been a greater acceptance of qualitative methods as appropriate for organizational research (Daft, 1980; Lincoln, 1985c; Strine & Pacanowsky, 1985).

Schwartz and Jacobs (1979) characterize the difference between qualitative and quantitative methods as one of notational systems. Quantitative researchers use a numerical notational system--they count and measure. In contrast, qualitative researchers use a "natural language" notational system (Schwartz & Jacobs, 1979). Qualitative researchers describe organizations using language rather than using counts or measures. Daft and Wiginton (1979) assert that natural language descriptions may lead to greater understanding of organizational functioning than mathematical descriptions. Schwartz and Jacobs (1979) compare qualitative reports with the newspaper's accounts of daily life. "This simple difference in commitment of notational systems corresponds to vast differences in values, goals, and procedures" (p. 4). Burrell and Morgan (1979) would likely add beliefs about the nature of reality to this listing.

The goal of qualitative research is "to understand people's behavior in terms of their own 'everyday thoughts'--the perceptions, meanings, and interpretations that they give to their daily lives" (Calder, 1980, p. 400). In order to facilitate such understanding, Denzin (1983) and Geertz (1973) call for "thick" description. Such description "goes beyond fact to detail, context, emotion, and (the) web of affiliation and micropower" (Denzin, 1983, p. 144). In accordance with this view, many interpretive researchers would argue that qualitative techniques are a way "to move beyond the simple description of relational structures to an interpretation of them" (Albrecht & Ropp, 1982, p. 162). For these reasons, qualitative methods are frequently the most appropriate ones for answering questions asked in interpretive research.

Because the purpose of qualitative methods is to reflect the meanings and interpretations of organizational members, the techniques must allow the researcher "to experience the experience of the other person, to enter the world of the person's everyday thought" (Calder, 1980, p. 402). Thus, qualitative methodologies "have one overriding objective: to allow the researcher to share, participatively or vicariously, the experience of a group of people" (Calder, 1980, p. 402). In this same vein, Denzin (1983) and Smircich (1983c) argue that immersion into the phenomenon under study allows for better understanding and expression of the phenomenon. This view captures Burrell and Morgan's (1979) notion of an ideographic approach.

A number of techniques fit under the umbrella or canopy of qualitative research (Lindlof & Meyer, in press; Van Maanen, 1982,

1983). These methods "gain access to the natural domain where social actors carry out their characteristic activities" (Lindlof & Meyer, in press, p. 9). Qualitative methods include participant observation, simple observation, formal interviews, informal interviews, construction of life histories, and unobtrusive measures (e.g. archival data, audio visual recordings) (Lindlof & Meyer, in press; Van Maanen, 1982).

Morgan and Smircich (1980) argue that the case for qualitative methods is appropriately made as one shifts toward the subjective side of the objective-subjective continuum (in Burrell and Morgan's 1979 scheme). Qualitative methods allow the researcher to focus upon the process of communication. In contrast, quantitative methods, coming from the "hard" sciences, are more appropriate for views of the social world as static or "concrete structure" (Morgan & Smircich, 1980). Similarly, Daft and Wiginton (1979) note that, "Perhaps those of us in the field of organizations tend to see the stable, tangible characteristics of organizations because those characteristics fit the correlation and regression models we were trained to use for organizational description" (p. 186). In contrast, a major strength of qualitative techniques is the process view to which they lend themselves.

The above discussion of quantitative versus qualitative methods has been at the forefront of much scholarly debate. However as Putnam (1982) asserts, it is less important than the epistemological assumptions underlying each paradigm. While the functionalist paradigm is characterized as having positivist epistemological assumptions (i.e.,

searches for causal relationships, laws, and regularity), the interpretive paradigm is anti-positivistic (i.e., concern with actors viewpoint, focus on understanding) (Burrell & Morgan, 1979). Thus, interpretive methodologies tend to be qualitative due to the focus on understandings, but certainly do not have to be (Sypher & Applegate, 1982). Triangulation, or the use of multiple qualitative and quantitative methods, is possible from any of the paradigms (Putnam, 1982). The following section examines language research conducted from an interpretive perspective and the methodologies utilized.

Interpretive Language Research

According to the underlying beliefs of the interpretive paradigm, intersubjective realities are created and sustained through the use of symbols, such as words and actions. While a number of researchers discuss the importance of language in organizational contexts (Bantz, 1983; Conrad, 1985; Deal and Kennedy, 1982, 1983; Louis, 1983; Ouchi & Wilkins, 1985; Pacanowsky & O'Donnell-Trujillo, 1982, 1983; Pettigrew, 1983; Putnam, 1983; Putnam & Cheney, 1984; Weick, 1983), few research pieces with such a focus have been published. The lack of published pieces is likely due to both the relative newness of the perspective and the resistence of some established journals to veer from the mainstream. This section reviews recent interpretive language research published in the fields of communication, management, and sociology. In general, such research examines cultural language or vocabularies, stories and myths, and texts.

Cultural Language or Vocabularies. Smircich and Morgan (1982) present the results of their ethnographic research conducted in an insurance company in case study form. In this study, multiple methods of data collection were used--observation, interviews, field notes, organizational documents, tape recordings, and researcher experiences. One major goal of their investigation was to explore how management's use of language shapes organizational reality. In this case, the president used language to create a future orientation, rather than a focus upon past problems. Smircich and Morgan (1982) also examine vocalized perceptions of other employees toward the president's desired reality. Their findings indicate that while the president strived to create a shared definition of reality (i.e. his desired reality), organizational members subscribed to a different reality. Thus, organizational participants rejected the interpretations of their leader and, in fact, created quite another reality.

Using the same data base, Smircich (1983b) examined how organizational members use language to achieve commonality and a sense of unity (i.e. see themselves as having a group identity). She argues that once common definitions and justifications occur that these created realities constrain human behavior. In this view, commonality or shared meanings are necessary so that "interaction can take place without constant interpretation and re-interpretation of meanings" (Smircich, 1983b, p. 64). For example, Smircich (1983b) reports that an organizational slogan, "Wheeling Together," constrained and shaped interactions among the management personnel. The assumption that reality is socially constructed is clearly illustrated in these two studies.

Hirsch and Andrews (1983) examine the language of corporate takeovers. While little attention is given to detailing their theoretical underpinnings, it is clear that they recognize (at least implicitly) that this language shapes perceptions. The product of their research is a listing of frequent images coded by genre and a dictionary of image meanings; however, the reader is left to guess at the methods which produced these results. What Hirsch and Andrews (1983) report is likely the groundwork for deeper analyses.

In their analysis of language, Smircich and Morgan (1982) mentioned military images. These appear to be extremely similar to the warfare genre discussed by Hirsch and Andrews (1983). Further attention should be given to how these symbols act to shape perceptions and create a social reality (or realities).

In a paper describing how managers can shape (and perhaps control) organizational realities, Smircich (1983a) briefly touches upon two cases of symbolic definition. These are the "energy crisis" and the "Japanese invasion." Smircich (1983a) argues that while other definitions were certainly possible (e.g. energy distribution problem, U.S. failure, etc.), the language used by American managers created certain definitions and perspectives in the majority of the U.S. population. This article clearly points out the importance of reality creation.

In his analysis, Evered (1983) details the complexity of Naval language and examines how such language shapes world views and develops realities. He maintains that every organization develops its own

language system and uses the Navy as an example of a highly complex organization with a great deal of specialized language. As in Smircich's (1983b) research, Evered (1983) describes how language is used to develop commonality. Although he fails to fully describe the study's theoretical backing and methodology, Evered (1983) provides us with a good description of language in one organization.

Based on observations of doctor-patient interactions, Emerson (1970a, 1970b) discusses the role of language in creating and sustaining reality (i.e. definition of the situation) in gynecological examinations. For example, Emerson (1970a) explores technical language, euphemisms, and other linguistic devices for their purposes in perpetuating the desired reality. Some of the medical language examined is similar to that in Evered's (1983) analysis of technical Naval language.

Clearly, Emerson (1970a, 1970b) sees reality as a socially constructed and negotiated phenomenon. As such, her interest focuses upon how communicative behaviors influence the process of reality creation and maintenance, as well as, shared definitions.

In an ethnographic study, Gregory (1983) conducted open-ended interviews with approximately 75 professionals in Silicon Valley computer companies. Her research goal was to understand the "natives" (i.e. members of particular cultures) and their use of language. After transcribing and examining the interview data, Gregory (1983) asserts that these organizational members use a variety of language taxonomies to make sense of their organizational lives.

Using both qualitative (i.e. interviews and observations) and quantitative techniques (i.e. Q-sort methodology), Barley (1983) examined the language systems used by funeral directors to create and sustain particular realities (i.e. everything is fine in the face of a tragic event). Barley's (1983) work, as did Gregory's (1983), focused upon describing implicit organizing schemes demonstrated through the language of organizational members.

This review of cultural language and vocabulary studies indicates a great deal of diversity (e.g. with-in organization language, inter-actional language, language as an indicator of classification schemes). Relatively little research attention has been accorded to this area of organizational life. Despite problems with each of the above pieces, their richness indicates the necessity of further study in this area.

Stories and Myths. Mitroff and Kilmann (1975) assert that "if accounting and finance are the backbone of organizations, then the stories which permeate all organizations of any size are their lifeblood" (p. 18). Despite wide agreement on their importance (Bormann, 1983; Brown, 1983, 1984; Deal & Kennedy, 1983; Pacanowsky & O'Donnell-Trujillo, 1982; Siehl & Martin, 1982), only recently have organizational stories and myths begun to be examined.

One realm of story research is in organizational socialization. For example, Martin (1982) asserts that implicit forms of communication, such as stories, function to help organizational members learn about the culture, philosophies, and policies of a particular organization. However, the vast majority of this research is functionalist in nature

(e.g. Brown, 1983; Siehl & Martin, 1982). The first phase of Kreps' (1983) research on stories and socialization is the only published piece which can be incorporated here. Although Kreps (1983) is interested in a number of phenomena, he does briefly develop the contribution of stories to RCA's culture. Gathered by qualitative means (e.g. interviews, observations, analysis of documents), these stories contribute greatly to organizational folklore which members learn during employment.

Pondy (1983) examines the use of myths and metaphors. Much like Hirsch and Andrews (1983), Pondy (1983) is concerned with the development and use of images. Again, Hirsch and Andrews' (1983) warfare images emerge. Pondy (1983) argues, based on analysis of data gathered by others, that myths are sense-making tools and play a huge role in the creation of reality.

Brown's (1984) research on stories and myths in a county jail supports Pondy's (1983) conclusions. Using observational techniques, Brown (1984) gathered a variety of stories and myths which she asserts greatly aid workers in the sense-making process and provide direction for future activity. Thus, such stories and myths are a part of an organization's culture and shape thoughts and reality.

In an analysis of transcripts of minister sermons, lay member talks, and group discussions in two churches in Appalachia, Zimmermann and Seibert (1986) identified stories and metaphors. These stories and metaphors were examined in terms of their relationship with church teachings. The authors assert that stories and metaphors help

organizational members in making sense of the church philosophies, in understanding church teachings, and in developing a group identity.

Through extensive observation and interviews, Smith and Simmons (1983) detail how a group of organization members came to think of themselves as like the Rumpelstiltskin legend. These authors argue that this framework provided a way of thinking and making sense of the organization's condition. Thus, this myth created reality and constrained actions.

As of yet, little interpretive research on stories and myths has been conducted. Perhaps future interpretive research will contribute to our understanding of this area of organizational activity.

Texts. Organizational texts are also an important area of interpretive investigation (Deetz, 1982). Huff (1983) advocates the study of documents in order to discover the nature of the organization. In this view, the language of documents plays a major role in the creation of reality. Based on her examination of university documents, Huff (1983) concludes that "by the way they are organized, the tone they convey, and the vocabulary they provide, these documents provide organization members with important material for organizing meaning" (p. 181). As with specialized language, stories, and myths, interpretive research is just beginning to explore organizational texts.

Implications and Future Directions

Interpretive language research generated thus far suffers from a number of shortcomings. First, many pieces do not clearly lay out the

theoretical assumptions of the authors. Several researchers espouse a socially constructed view of reality, but go no further in detailing their particular views or research tradition (i.e., the reader is given little or no information regarding the study's theoretical underpinnings). In addition, it appears that articles containing the phrase "socially-constructed reality" are frequently labeled interpretive when, in fact, they are not according to Burrell and Morgan's (1979) scheme. Future authors should clearly detail their theoretical beliefs and assumptions in order to increase reader understanding.

Second, little attention is frequently given to detailing the method(s) employed. For example, Brown (1984), Emerson (1970a), Evered (1983), Huff (1983), Hirsch and Andrews (1983), and Pondy (1983) use only brief phrases to describe how they arrived at their results. For example, phrases such as "participant observation" and "analysis of stories" alone do not tell the reader exactly what was done in the research or analysis. Thus, researchers need to more fully describe the technique(s) they employ.

Third, it is obvious from the few studies found that interpretive language research is in its infancy. As it develops, perhaps these shortcoming will be eliminated. While these studies may be few in number, they provide the beginning of an interesting and hopefully productive line of research. In order to be truly beneficial, each piece of research needs to thoroughly detail the philosophical underpinnings guiding it and the methodological choices making it

possible. Such details are especially important in this early phase of interpretive organizational study.

This perspective regards communication as central in organizational life. From such a perspective, little is more profitable to study than the systems of symbols used by members of organizations. As Pettigrew (1983) argues "language is not just outside us and given to us . . . , it is also within us, we create it, and it impels us" (p. 94). Thus, it is not surprising that the perspective is gaining popularity despite the old, ingrained philosophical and methodological training and difficulty in publishing.

In conclusion, the interpretive perspective has much to offer organizational analysis. It allows us to explore new phenomena, as well as, old phenomena in new ways. While functionalist research is still important and has much to offer, it is now "supplemented by equally important analysis of symbolic forms and political processes" (Conrad, 1985, p. 191). Research from the interpretive paradigm is likely to greatly contribute to our understanding.

The Radical Humanist Paradigm

Theoretical Underpinnings

The radical humanist paradigm shares many commonalities with the interpretive paradigm. These include its nominalistic, anti-positivistic, voluntaristic, and ideographic tendencies (Burrell & Morgan, 1979). However, its position on the regulation-radical change dimension is in direct contrast to the interpretive paradigm's position. While the in-

terpretive paradigm involves a regulatory stance, the radical humanist paradigm subscribes to a radical change position. Burrell and Morgan (1979) describe radical change as assuming a position which "emphasizes the importance of overthrowing or transcending the limitations of existing social arrangements" (p. 32). Thus, although these two paradigms share beliefs that reality is created subjectively, such beliefs are used in fundamentally different ways.

Due to its subjective and radical change standpoints, the radical humanist paradigm is quite unlike the functionalist paradigm, which assumes objective reality and regulatory positions. In fact, Burrell and Morgan (1979) regard it as "an inversion of the assumptions which define the functionalist paradigm" (p. 33). Similarly, Clark (1985) characterizes radical humanism as the "antithesis" of functionalism. Thus, proponents of this paradigm hold an extremely different world view from those involved in the majority of mainstream organizational research.

Based on these fundamental differences, radical humanists severely critique the work of functionalists. From a radical humanist perspective, functionalism is regarded as a way of maintaining and reinforcing the status quo. And as such, functionalism is argued to perpetuate domination and alienation (Burrell & Morgan, 1979).

Burrell & Morgan (1979) assert that the result of a radical humanist perspective will result in anti-organization theory. This inversion of functionalism is likely to produce thought which is in direct contrast with organization theory. At present, Burrell and Morgan (1979) see

anti-organization theory in "embryonic form." However, they view anti-organization theory as "stress(ing) the importance of the mode of organization reflecting a particular totality, rather than the importance of organizations as discrete middle-range units of analysis worthy of attention in their own right" (Burrell & Morgan, 1979, p. 311).

As expected, functionalists have low regard and heavy criticism for radical humanist views. In general, an advocate of the functionalist perspective "dismisses radical humanists as utopian radicals hell-bent upon fanning the flames of revolutionary consciousness, or as mindless existentialists who will not or cannot adjust to the world of everyday 'reality' and accept the inevitable march of 'progress'" (Burrell & Morgan, 1979, p. 307).

Although there are varying strains of thought within the radical humanist paradigm (i.e., solipsism, French existentialism, anarchistic individualism, and critical theory), all are undergirded by an interest in emancipating the human spirit (Burrell & Morgan, 1979). The metaphor of a psychic prison is often used to describe radical humanist thought (Morgan, et al., 1983; Putnam, 1982). From this perspective, humans are viewed as both creating and sustaining alienating organizational forms. These "self-laid traps" (Morgan, 1984; Morgan, et al., 1983) are a major focus of radical humanist approaches. Thus, the goals of radical humanist thought are to understand how such alienation occurs, to discover ways to free the human spirit, and to promote human development (Burrell & Morgan, 1979; Morgan, 1984).

While many organization researchers characterize radical humanism as "embryonic in form" (Burrell & Morgan, 1979; Deetz & Kersten, 1983), some radical humanist discussions have focused attention on the importance of language. Specifically, those following the critical theory tradition accord power to language (Forester, 1983). According to Morgan, et al (1983), "the focus of the critical theory tradition rests upon a 'critique' of modes of symbolic discourse" (p. 25). Thus, from such a perspective, language is critically examined for properties of domination. For example, Habermas has emphasized the properties of domination embedded in systems of language from such a perspective (Burrell & Morgan, 1979; Forester, 1983; Wuthnow, Hunter, Bergesen, & Kurzweil, 1984). In addition, critical theory gives attention to aiding humans in realizing how they are dominated through discourse and in taking responsibility for their own reality constructions (Morgan, 1984; Morgan, et al., 1983).

Morgan et al. (1983) cite the women's movement as an example of helping people realize how male dominated organizations and societies exploit and dominate females. "As the women's movement has already begun to show, the language of traditional organization (e.g. manager, chairman, manpower) transmits codes of expectation as to who is equipped to do what, and an awareness of this process raises consciousness with regard to these processes of domination within organizations which are at least partially sustained through the language used" (Morgan, et al., 1983, p. 26). It is clear that language is an important area of inquiry from the radical humanist perspective.

Research Methods

Due to beliefs in the subjective creation of reality, radical humanists are most likely to employ ideographic methods. As in interpretive research, these predominately qualitative techniques are used because they are better equipped to answer questions posed and to provide understanding (Burrell & Morgan, 1979; Glennon, 1983). Thus, many of the methods used in interpretive research are also important in radical humanist research (e.g. participation, observation, interviews) (Forester, 1983; White & McSwain, 1983).

According to Forester (1983), research strategies which are phenomenological and structural are highly important. Phenomenological techniques allow one to focus upon shared meanings and understandings enacting organizational life. Structural methods involve examining the "economic, political, and social contexts" in which organizational members function (p. 245).

Both Glennon (1983) and Wilson (1983) assert that "subjects" should play a greater role in research. For example, "subjects" should be free to ask questions, make suggestions, and participate in the research. In such collaborative research, it is argued that each (i.e., researcher and subjects) learns from the other. In addition, Wilson (1993) maintains that such behavior will promote equality between the "researcher" and the "researched."

Radical Humanist Language Research

As previously addressed, there is little interpretive research focusing upon language; however, even less radical humanist language research has been published. At this point, the utility of the radical paradigms for organizational study are just beginning to be realized.

Witten (1986) explores the role of organizational stories as covert control mechanisms which serve to maintain the status quo. Based on participant observation, Witten (1986) asserts that stories impart norms, promote uncontested acceptance of values, and inhibit the likelihood of change initiations. She sees stories as a "potent force for the control of thought and action" (p. 18). In a position paper, Deetz and Kersten (1983) also subscribe to the belief that accepted ideologies subvert critical examinations of the status quo.

In order to promote realization and change, Witten (1986) calls for organizational members to inspect and discuss their taken-for-granted assumptions. It is her belief that this questioning process and the ensuing discussion will break the "passive acquiescence" affecting most organizational participants. Thus, through communication, liberation may come. Witten (1986) calls into remembrance Thayer's (1982) words: "Communication is not just something that people do; it is the process in which we have our humanity--whatever and however that shall be" (p. 28).

From a structurationist perspective, (See McPhee & Poole, 1980 or Poole & McPhee, 1983 for a detailed discussion of this theory), Riley

(1983) examined organizational politics. Using interview data from two firms, she focused upon language and symbols important in creating and reproducing political images in each organization. Her findings illustrate, as do many interpretive pieces, the role of language in shaping reality. However, Riley (1983) views language as a source of legitimation and domination--it creates structures (i.e. emergence from social constructions) which constrain humans. In this analysis, Riley (1983) does not address ways to alleviate this domination.

Morgan (1983b) asserts that organizational researchers have been imprisoned by the metaphors they have constructed. For example, Morgan (1980) argues that functionalist metaphors, such as machine and organism, have dominated research thought. He argues that by entertaining new metaphors, derived from alternative paradigms, that this domination can be thwarted.

In a form of analysis similar to Morgan's (1980), Calas and Smircich (1985) comment upon the "language of science." These authors assert that science has a "preferred mode of discourse" (p. 2) and this language or mode has constrained the vast majority of academics. In order to lessen the domination, Calas and Smircich (1985) favor alternative languages, such as narrative. In this same vein, Lincoln (1985a) asserts that "when words do not exist for constructs, there is no recognition that such states are possible" (p. 222). Thus, these authors make essentially the same recommendation as does Morgan (1980).

In their analysis of the disintegration of an educational organization, Grimes and Cornwall (forthcoming) briefly examine the role

of language and myths. These authors argue that the ideologies created and sustained by organizational members served to distort their views. For example, organizational language emphasized the positive and Utopian aspects of organizational life and thus, dominated member views of reality.

In an examination of strategies designed to purge sexism from languages, Hellinger (1984) sees language as a means of reinforcing the status quo and dominant stereotypes. "Members of a speech community exercise personal control through language, but they are also controlled by language" (Hellinger, 1984, p. 143). Through this process, human thought is limited to envisioning females in certain roles. Hellinger (1984) and Spender (1984) argue that through language planning and change, humans can liberate themselves. In addition, these authors assert that the dominant group's legitimacy will be changed. Spender (1984) maintains that males have long held the dominant position and thereby were able to define reality in their terms and using their language. She argues that the language and experiences of both sexes must be incorporated in reality definitions for liberation to occur.

While few in number, language examinations from a radical humanist perspective begin to point out negative implications of organizational existence. These pieces emphasize how language acts to create realities, to dominate human thought, and to enslave people to their own perceptions.

Implications and Future Directions

There are many more calls for language research from this paradigm than there are actual research examinations. Such calls illustrate the need for further inquiry in this arena.

The work of Calas and Smircich (1985), Grimes and Cornwall (forthcoming), Morgan (1983b), and Witten (1986) show the utility of examining stories, myths, and metaphors. These authors begin to develop our knowledge of how these devices may shape and constrain thought. Obviously, these are important areas for future researchers to address. At this point, little is known about the process by which this distortion occurs or the ways to liberate one's self from it.

Radical humanist authors should more specifically address ways to bring about change (i.e. liberation). In previous articles, change is called for, but glossed over or asserted to come about through discourse. Researchers must further describe the types of discourse likely to result in change and the ways to achieve such interaction.

The majority of radical humanist work conducted thus far fails to delineate theoretical background and methodologies used. Therefore, it is often difficult, or impossible, to determine the school of thought guiding research pieces. In the future, researchers should clearly ground their work in a research tradition and lay out its assumptions. Such discussion can only add clarity to work in this area.

Despite the limited amount of articles and their shortcomings, radical humanist language research appears to be an area with future promise. These authors begin to call into question previously

unquestioned areas if organizational functioning. This process of questioning is a vast difference from functionalist and interpretive research.

The Radical Structuralist Paradigm

Theoretical Underpinnings

In contrast to interpretivists and radical humanists, proponents of the radical structuralist paradigm argue that there is an objective reality which exists independently of and separate from individual cognitions. Although both functionalists and radical structuralists assume such objectivist positions, radical structuralists have a different purpose-- emancipation through social change. Thus, Burrell and Morgan (1979) characterize radical structuralists as objective and favoring radical change on their two dimensions.

Both radical humanists and radical structuralists see organizations as oppressing humans. However, radical humanists believe that such oppression is constructed symbolically through interaction and concentrate upon raising consciousness in order to liberate humans. In contrast, radical structuralists assert that the oppression is "real" and call for social change to improve the human condition (Burrell & Morgan, 1979; Morgan, et al., 1983). Thus, radical structuralists argue that social structures must undergo change in order to free individuals. Due to this belief, radical structuralists focus upon "deep economic and political 'structures' in their analysis" (Burrell & Morgan, 1979, p. 307).

From a radical structuralist perspective, "organizations are viewed as instruments of domination, manipulated and controlled by ruling interests who dominate other sections of society in pursuit of their own

ends" (Morgan, et al., 1983, p. 28). And furthermore, the catalyst to societal change is contained within the organizations and societal system themselves (Burrell & Morgan, 1979; Morgan, 1984). For example, Morgan (1984) argues that this view is "premised on the dialectical notion that everything changes itself as a result of the tensions that its very existence creates" (p. 321).

Although the radical structuralist paradigm consists of different schools of thought (arising mainly from the works of Marx and Weber) (Burrell & Morgan, 1979; Morgan, et al., 1983), each contains four fundamental beliefs. These are totality, structure, contradiction, and crisis (Burrell & Morgan, 1979). Totality refers to the emphasis placed upon examining "total social formations." The notion of structure captures the paradigm's belief in "hard" social formations. As previously discussed, it is this belief and its focus on structures that distinguishes this perspective from radical humanism. It is argued that internal contradictions exist in the social system which lead to the demise of structures. Crisis is defined as occurring due to the contradictions and transforming structures into new and different kinds.

Ideology is accorded some importance by radical structuralists. For example, attention is given to the "way in which a dominant ideology is fostered, manipulated, and controlled by those in power, to sustain the socio-economic mode of production upon which the society is based" (Morgan, et al., 1983, p. 28). In this view, language is regarded as a symbol which serves to shape and foster this ideology. According to Morgan, et al. (1983), the radical structuralist perspective has much to

contribute in "demonstrating the detailed manner in which symbol systems are used to manipulate and shape attitudes of the workforce in the service of organizational ends" (p. 29).

Thus, the radical structuralist paradigm is quite unlike the radical humanist and interpretive paradigms. As such, its methods tend to be much different than radical humanist and interpretivist methods.

Research Methods

While the radical humanist and interpretive paradigms are characterized as using ideographic methods, Burrell and Morgan (1979) describe the radical structuralist paradigm as exhibiting a preference for nomothetic methods. Such methods are based on established scientific protocols and employ quantitative procedures (e.g. surveys, questionnaires, and etc.). Techniques such as these are very common in functionalist research. However, it is also possible to employ qualitative techniques in research from the radical structuralist paradigm (Heydebrand, 1983).

Benson (1983) asserts that what is truly important about methods chosen for radical structuralist research is that they are able to capture the basic contradictions in the social structure. Simply describing organizations as stable structures does not represent a dialectical view. In addition, Benson (1983) also argues that methodological choices must allow for examination of the overall political economy in which organizations exist.

Radical Structuralist Language Research

Although organization theory has been influenced by the writings of radical structuralists, such as Marx and Foucault, little empirical research has been conducted from this perspective (Monge et al., 1984; Putnam, 1982). Furthermore, when examining the research produced, only a very minor amount focuses upon language.

In his critical writings, Foucault, who was heavily influenced by Marx and Durkheim, is concerned with institutional forces which both perpetuate and inhibit human thought (Wuthnow, et al., 1984). While some would consider him a radical humanist, this emphasis places Foucault in the radical structuralist quadrant of Burrell and Morgan's (1979) scheme. At the heart of Foucault's work is a focus upon discourse, language, and communication. For example, Foucault comments upon language use and its contribution to building society and societal structures. In addition, he is also concerned with the effects of such structures on discourse (Withnow, et al., 1984).

Foucault's methods are much unlike traditional empirical methods (Wuthnow, et al., 1984). Often using historical analysis, Foucault pieces together documents and records to understand occurrences. Rather than calling for change per se, he examines how changes have occurred and their effects on individuals (i.e. how domination was achieved). He supports his arguments with numerous examples and argues, based on his examination of historical trends, than an end is imminent for this age of humankind (Wuthnow, et al., 1984).

Bennett and Edelman (1985) attempt to demonstrate, through example, how powerful political forces and the news media control the narratives or stories for public consumption. They cite examples, such as Grenada and the 1984 El Salvadoran election, of how dominant forces selected certain ideas for public broadcast and omitted others. In their view, "the day to day picture maybe reassuringly familiar, but the long view reveals a society burdened with nuclear nightmare, growing inequality, and chronic conditions of psychological and physical illness" (Bennett & Edelman, 1985, p. 157). These authors further assert that "when a ruling group promotes its cherished ideals at the expense of critical evaluations of the actions taken in the name of those ideals, the telling of familiar tales becomes a comforting fantasy--escape from the otherwise unpleasant contradictions of life experience" (Bennett & Edelman, 1985, p. 158).

Perrow's (1984) discussion of normal accidents indirectly overlaps Bennett and Edelman's (1985) arguments. While Perrow (1984) does not specifically focus upon the role of the dominant class and the media in controlling language and the telling of stories, he is concerned about the public's unawareness of normal accidents.

In order to alleviate the problem of one-sided reporting, Bennett and Edelman (1985) call for a "new political narrative." According to these authors, this form of narrative would focus upon "contradictions and normative dilemmas within the same story" (Bennett & Edelman, 1985, p. 170). Thus, through such discourse, awareness, critique, and change are more likely to occur.

Schultz (1984) expresses concerns related to those of Bennett and Edelman (1985). Her argument is that because those in power control the publishing industry, they determine what work will be published and hence valued. O'Barr (1984) asserts that "language is the mirror, the vehicle, and the means for expression of many political relations (p. 260). In his perspective, language and language policies controlled by governments govern "access to economic, political, and social opportunities" (O'Barr, 1984, p. 266). Thus, those in the ruling class also dominate through the control of language. Plato's remark that "those who tell the stories also rule the society" (Homo Narrans, 1985, p. 73) certainly seems to summarize well the arguments of these authors.

Using four case studies as examples, Abravanel (1983) argues that organizational myths or stories are sources of member domination. According to Abravanel (1983), dominant groups use such myths for their own purposes. One purpose is to resolve or obscure organizational contradictions. Abravanel (1983) calls for future analysis using his analytical framework. While he does not directly deal with change, it can be assumed that the use of his framework would impact on research findings and thus, change perceptions of organizations.

In an examination much like Abravanel's (1983), Darrand and Shupe (1983) explore metaphors as a method of social control. These authors rely on examples and interpretations to support their points. In their belief, metaphors guide people in shaping relationships with others and thereby the structures which form through such interaction. Then, these structures and their ritualized practices pervade human thought and behavior.

In summary, these radical structuralist focuses upon the role of language rely heavily upon author analysis and cited examples. All are undergirded by the belief that social structures and their languages subordinate individuals.

Implications and Future Directions

As previously noted, very little research focusing upon language has been conducted from the radical structuralist paradigm. This is likely due to the perspective's emphasis on the totality. Language is only one part of the organization and is commonly viewed as a micro area of study by structuralists. However, the few studies discussed above begin to demonstrate the utility in exploring how institutional language constrains humans. In addition, examinations of dominant ideologies can greatly contribute to knowledge on the ways in which social structures are maintained.

Although this area is devoid of actual research pieces, numerous calls for research on the dominant ideology are made in essays and position papers. It is this authors hope that answers to these calls will carve out a niche in organization theory for such research.

A serious limitation of these language pieces is their omission of methodological and theoretical discussions. Few of these authors even mentioned the school of thought guiding their critique or discussed their theoretical underpinnings. In addition, most studies were filled with examples, but little attention was given to describing how/where these were collected (i.e., participant observation, document analysis, informant interviews, etc.). Attention to such areas will improve future research.

While these language articles may reach the goal of raising awareness, they do little to suggest improvements or directions for change. Future authors should attempt to present readers with possible avenues of change or with details on how the existing contradictions are likely to bring change.

Conclusions

As Rosnow (1981) suggests, "social psychology (needs) to move on many levels instead of the single paradigmatic level that has been tested and found wanting" (p. 119). The dominance of the functionalist paradigm has for too long constrained research choices and stifled knowledge development (White, 1983). While no one tradition of research can answer all possible questions, the three nonfunctionalist paradigms allow researchers to address interesting and untapped areas of organizational life. As Morgan (1984) argues, research should "harness the possibilities they (the paradigms) offer" (p. 324).

Research from each of the paradigms is likely to contribute to our limited understanding of language in organizations. While each researcher has his/her own world view or paradigm preference, work from each paradigm is important. As Burrell and Morgan (1979) discuss, critique of a paradigm should not be made from outside its assumptions. Morgan (1983a) summarizes this point by stating, "In everyday life we would not normally dream of applying criteria in judging the quality of a cream cake in the assessment of a slice of roast beef. One wonders, therefore, why we engage in this kind of activity in social science" (p. 393). We can benefit from knowledge generated in each paradigm and should "harness" this potential.

However, despite the overall benefits of heterodoxy, individual researchers must make theoretical and methodological choices. As Calas and Smircich (1985) note, "you can't dance with different partners--it is impossible to value all perspectives, methodologies, and the like as being of equal value" (p. 5). Thus, these theoretical underpinnings and methodological decisions used by researchers must be incorporated in research articles. Through such detailing, one can better understand research pieces from all perspectives and how they fit into the overall framework of knowledge.

References

Abravanel, H. (1983). Mediatory myths in the service of organizational ideology. In L.R. Pondy, P.J. Frost, G. Morgan, & T.C. Dandridge (Eds.), Organizational symbolism. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI, 273-293.

Albrecht, T. & Ropp, V. (1982). The study of network structuring in organizations through the use of method triangulation. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 46, 162-179.

Astley, W.G. & Van de Ven, A.H. (1983). Central perspectives and debates in organization theory. Administrative Science Quarterly, 28, 245-272.

Bantz, C.R. (1983). Naturalistic research traditions. In L.L. Putnam & M.E. Pacanowsky (Eds.), Communication and organizations: An interpretive approach. Beverly Hills: Sage, 55-71.

Barley, S.R. (1983). Semiotics and the study of occupational and organizational cultures. Administrative Science Quarterly, 28, 393-413.

Bennett, W.L. & Edelman, M. (1985). Toward a new political narrative. Journal of Communication, 35, 156-171

Benson, J. K. (1977). Organizations: A dialectical view. Administrative Science Quarterly, 22, 1-21.

Benson, J.K. (1983). A dialectical method for the study of organizations. In G. Morgan (Ed.), Beyond method: Strategies for social research. Beverly Hills: Sage, 331-346.

Berlin, I. (1953). The hedgehog and the fox: An essay on Tolstoy's view of history. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Bormann, E.G. (1983). Symbolic convergence: Organizational communication and culture. In L.L. Putnam & M.E. Pacanowsky, (Eds.), Communication and organizations: An interpretive approach. Beverly Hills: Sage, 99-122.

Brown, M.H. (1983). That reminds me of a story: Speech actions in organizational socialization. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention in Washington, D.C., 1-35.

Brown, M.H. (1984). Pulling chain: Stories, culture, and the county jail. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Speech Communication Association, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

Burrell, G. & Morgan, G. (1979). Sociological paradigms and organisational analysis. London: Heinemann.

Calas, M.B. & Smircich, L. (1985). Reading leadership as a form of cultural analysis. Paper presented at the Eighth Biennial Leadership Conference, Lubbock, Texas.

Calder, B.J. (1980). Focus group interviews and qualitative research in organizations. In E.E. Lawler, D.A. Nadler, & C. Cammann (Eds.), Organizational assessment: Perspectives on the measurement of organizational behavior and the quality of work life. New York: Wiley, 399-417.

Cartwright, D. (1973). Determinants of scientific progress: The case of research on the risky shift. American Psychologist, 28, 222-231.

Clark, D.L. (1985). Emerging paradigms in organizational theory and research. In Y.S. Lincoln (Ed.), Organizational theory and inquiry: The paradigm revolution. Beverly Hills: Sage, 43-78.

Conrad, C. (1985). Chrysanthemums and swords: A reading of contemporary organizational communication theory and research. Southern Speech Communication Journal, 50, 189-200.

Coulthard, M. (1977). An introduction to discourse analysis. Essex: Longman.

Daft, R. (1980). The evolution of organizational analysis in ASQ: 1959-1979. Administrative Science Quarterly, 24, 630-638.

Daft, R.L. & Wiginton, J.C. (1979). Language and organization. Academy of Management Review, 4, 179-191.

Darrand, T.C. & Shupe, A. (1983). Metaphors of social control in a pentecostal sect. New York: Edwin Mellen.

Deal, T. & Kennedy, A. (1982). Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of corporate life. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Deal, T.E. & Kennedy, A.A. (1983). Culture: A new look through old lenses. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 19, 498-505.

Deetz, S.A. (1982). Critical interpretive research in organizational communication. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 46, 131-149.

Deetz, S.A. & Kersten, A. (1983). Critical models of interpretive research. In L.L. Putnam & M.E. Pacanowsky (Eds.), Communication and organizations: An interpretive approach, Beverly Hills: Sage, 147-171.

Denzin, N.K. (1983). Interpretive interactionism. In G. Morgan (Ed.), Beyond method: Strategies for social research. Beverly Hills: Sage, 129-146.

Emerson, J. (1970a). Behavior in private places: Sustaining definitions of reality in gynecological examinations. In H.P. Dreitzel (Ed.), Recent sociology no. 2. New York: Macmillan, 73-97.

Emerson, J. (1970b). Nothing unusual is happening. In T. Shibutani (Ed.), Human nature and collective behavior: Papers in honor of Herbert Blower. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Evered, R. (1983). The language of organizations: The case of the Navy. In L.R. Pondy, P.J. Frost, G. Morgan, & T.C. Dandridge (Eds.), Organizational symbolism. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI, 125-143.

Faules, D. (1982). The use of multi-methods in the organizational setting. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 46, 150-161.

Fischer, F. & Sirianni, C. (1984). Organization theory and bureaucracy: A critical introduction. In F. Fischer & C. Sirianni (Eds.), Critical studies in organization and bureaucracy. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 3-20.

Forester, J. (1983). Critical theory and organizational analysis. In G. Morgan (Ed.), Beyond method: Strategies for social research. Beverly Hills: Sage, 234-246.

Geertz, C. (1973). Thick description: Toward an interpretive theory of culture. In The interpretation of cultures. New York: Basic Books.

Glennon, L. (1983). Synthesism: A case of feminist methodology. In G. Morgan (Ed.), Beyond method: Strategies for social research. Beverly Hills: Sage, 260-271.

Gregory, K.L. (1983). Native-view paradigms: Multiple cultures and culture conflicts in organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 28, 359-376.

Grimes, A.J. & Cornwall, J.R. (forthcoming) The disintegration of an organization: A dialectical analysis. Academy of Management Journal.

Gronn, P.C. (1983). Talk as the work: The accomplishment of school administration. Administrative Science Quarterly, 28 1-21.

Gumperz, J. (1972). The speech community. In P.P. Giglioli (Ed.), Language and social context. New York: Penquin, 219-231.

Hellinger, M. (1984). Effecting social change through group action: Feminine occupational titles in transition. In C. Kramarae, M. Schulz, W.M. O'Barr (Eds.), Language and power. Beverly Hills: Sage, 136-153.

Heydebrand, W.V. (1983). Organization and praxis. In G. Morgan (Ed.), Beyond method: Strategies for social research. Beverly Hills: Sage, 306-319.

Hirsch, P.M. & Andrews, J.A.Y. (1983). Ambushes, shootouts, and knights of the round table: The language of corporate takeovers. In L.R. Pondy, P.J. Frost, G. Morgan, & T.C. Dandridge (Eds.), Organizational Symbolism. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI, 145-155.

Homo Narrans: Story-telling in mass culture and everyday life. (1985). Journal of Communication, 73.

Huff, A.S. (1983). A rhetorical examination of strategic change. In L.R. Pondy, P.J. Frost, G. Morgan, & T.C. Dandridge (Eds.), Organizational symbolism. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI, 167-183.

Kreps, G.L. (1983). Using interpretive research: The development of a socialization program at RCA. In L.L. Putnam & M.E. Pacanowsky (Eds.), Communication and organizations: An interpretive approach. Beverly Hills: Sage, 243-256.

Lincoln, Y.S. (1985a). Epilogue: Dictionaries for languages not yet spoken. In Y.S. Lincoln (Ed.), Organizational theory and inquiry: The paradigm revolution. Beverly Hills: Sage, 221-228.

Lincoln, Y.S. (1985b). Introduction. In Y.S. Lincoln (Ed.), Organizational theory and inquiry: The paradigm revolution. Beverly Hills: Sage, 29-40.

Lincoln, Y.S. (1985c). The substance of the emergent paradigm: Implications for researchers. In Y.S. Lincoln (Ed.), Organizational theory and inquiry: The paradigm revolution. Beverly Hills: Sage, 137-157.

Lindlof, T. & Meyer, T. (in press) Mediated communication as ways of seeing, acting, and constructing culture: The tools and foundations of qualitative research. In T. Lindlof (Ed.), Natural audiences: Qualitative research of media uses and effects. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Louis, M.R. (1983). Organizations as culture-bearing milieux. In L.R. Pondy, P.J. Frost, G. Morgan, & T.C. Dandridge (Eds.), Organizational symbolism. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI, 39-53.

Martin, J. (1982). Stories and scripts in organizational settings. In A. Hastorf & A. Isen (Eds.), Cognitive social psychology. New York: Elsevier North Holland, Inc., 255-266.

McPhee, R.D. (1984). Formal structure and organizational communication. In R.D. McPhee & P.K. Tompkins (Eds.), Organizational communication: Traditional themes and new directions. Beverly Hills: Sage, 149-177.

Mitroff. I.I. & Kilmann, R.H. (1975). Stories managers tell: A new tool for organizational problem solving. Management Review, 18-28.

Monge, P.R., Farace, R.V., Eisenberg, E.M., Miller, K.I., & White, L.L. (1984). The process of studying process in organizational communication. Journal of Communication, 34, 22-43.

Morgan, G. (1980). Paradigms, metaphors, and puzzle solving in organization theory. Administrative Science Quarterly, 25, 605-622.

Morgan, G. (1983a). Exploring choice: Reframing the process of evaluation. In G. Morgan (Ed.), Beyond method: Strategies for social research. Beverly Hills: Sage, 392-404.

Morgan, G. (1983b). More on metaphor: Why we cannot control tropes in administrative science. Administrative Science Quarterly, 28, 601-607.

Morgan, G. (1984). Opportunities arising from paradigm diversity. Administration & Society, 16, 306-327.

Morgan, G., Frost, P.J., & Pondy, L.R. (1983). Organizational symbolism. In L.R. Pondy, P.J. Frost, G. Morgan, & T.C. Dandridge (Eds.), Organizational symbolism. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI, 3-35.

Morgan, G. & Smircich, L. (1980). The case for qualitative research. Academy of Management Review, 5, 491-500.

O'Barr, W.M. (1984). Asking the right questions about language and power. In C. Kramarae, M. Schultz, & W.M. O'Barr (Eds.), Language and power. Beverly Hills: Sage, 260-280.

Ouchi, W.G. & Wilkins, A.L. (1975). Organizational culture. Annual Review of Sociology, 11, 457-483.

Pacanowsky, M. & O'Donnell-Trujillo, N. (1982). Communication and organizational cultures. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 46, 115-131.

Pacanowsky, M. & O'Donnell-Trujillo, N. (1983). Organizational communication as cultural performance. Communication Monographs, 50, 126-147.

Perrow, C. (1984). Normal accident at Three Mile Island. In F. Fisher & C. Sirianni (Eds.), Critical studies in organization and bureaucracy. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 287-305.

Pettigrew, A.M. (1983). On studying organizational cultures. In J. Van Maanen (Ed.), Qualitative Methodology. Beverly Hills: Sage, 87-104.

Pfeffer, J. (1982). Organizations and organization theory. Boston: Pitman.

Pondy, L.R. (1983). The role of metaphors and myths in organization and in the facilitation of change. In L.R. Pondy, P.J. Frost, G. Morgan, & T.C. Dandridge (Eds.), Organizational symbolism. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI, 157-165.

Poole, M.S. & McPhee, R.D. (1983). A structurational analysis of organizational climate. In L. Putnam & M. Pacanowsky (Eds.), Communication and organizations: An interpretive approach. Beverly Hills; Sage, 195-219.

Putnam, L.L. (1982). Paradigms for organizational communication research: An overview and synthesis. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 46, 192-206.

Putnam, L.L. (1983). The interpretive perspective: An alternative to functionalism. In L.L. Putnam & M.E. Pacanowsky (Eds.),

Communication and organizations: An interpretive approach. Beverly Hills: Sage, 31-54.

Putnam, L. & Cheney, G. (1984). New directions in organizational communication. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Chicago.

Redding, W.C. (1979). Organizational communication theory and ideology: An overview. In D. Nimmo (Ed.), Communication Yearbook 3. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction-International Communication Association, 309-341.

Riley, P. (1983). A structurationist account of political culture. Administrative Science Quarterly, 28, 414-437.

Roberts, K., O'Reilly, C., Bretton, G., & Porter, L. (1974). Organizational theory and organizational communication: A communication failure? Human Relations, 27, 501-524.

Rosnow, R.L. (1981). Paradigms in transition: The methodology of social inquiry. New York: Oxford University Press.

Schultz, M. (1984). Minority writers: The struggle for authenticity and authority. In C. Kramarae, M. Schultz, & W.M. O'Barr (Eds.), Language and power. Beverly Hills: Sage, 206-217.

Schwartz, H. & Jacobs, J. (1979). Qualitative sociology: A method to the madness. New York: The Free Press.

Siehl, C. & Martin, J. (1982). Learning organizational culture. Unpublished research paper, no. 654. Graduate School of Business, Stanford University.

Smircich, L. (1983a). Implications for management theory. In L. Putnam & M. Pacanowsky (Eds.), Communication and organizations. Beverly Hills: Sage, 221-241.

Smircich, L. (1983b). Organizations as shared meanings. In L.R. Pondy, P.J. Frost, G Morgan, & T.C. Dandridge (Eds.), Organizational symbolism. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI, 55-65.

Smircich, L. (1983c). Studying organizations as cultures. In G. Morgan (Ed.), Beyond method: Strategies for social research. Beverly Hills: Sage, 160-172.

Smircich, L. & Morgan, G. (1982). Leadership: The management of meaning. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 18, 257-273.

Smith, K.K. & Simmons, V.M. (1983). A Rumpelstiltskin organization: Metaphors on metaphors in field research. Administrative Science Quarterly, 28, 377-392.

Spender, D. (1984). Defining reality: A powerful tool. In C. Knamarae, M. Schultz, W.M. O'Barr (Eds.), Language and power. Beverly Hills: Sage, 194-205.

Strine, M.S. & Pacanowsky, M.E. (1985). How to read interpretive accounts of organizational life: Narrative bases of textual authority. Southern Speech Communication Journal, 50, 283-297.

Sypher, B.D. & Applegate, J.L. (1982). Interpretive approaches to the study of organizational cultures: The need for theoretical choices. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association Convention, Louisville, Ky.

Thayer, L. (1982). What would a theory of communication be for? Journal of Applied Communication Research, 10, 21-28.

Van Maanen, J. (1982). Introduction. In J. Van Maanen, J.M. Dabbs, & R.R. Faulkner (Eds.), Varieties of qualitative research. Beverly Hills: Sage, 11-29.

Van Maanen, J. (1983). Reclaiming qualitative methods for organizational research: A preface. In J. Van Maanen (Ed.), Qualitative methodology. Beverly Hills: Sage, 9-18.

Weick, K.E. (1983). Organizational communication: Toward a research agenda. In L.L. Putnam & M.E. Pacanowsky (Eds.), Communication and organizations: An interpretive approach. Beverly Hills: Sage, 13-29.

White, O.F. (1983). Improving the prospects for heterodoxy in organization theory: A review of sociological paradigms and organizational analysis by Gibson Burrell and Gareth Morgan, Administration & Society, 15, 257-272.

White, O.F. & McSwain, C.J. (1983). Transformational theory and organizational analysis. In G. Morgan (Ed.), Beyond method: Strategies for social research. Beverly Hills: Sage, 292-305.

Wilson, H.T. (1983). Anti-method as a counterstructure in social research practice. In G. Morgan (Ed.), Beyond method: Strategies for social research. Beverly Hills: Sage, 247-259.

Witten, M. (1986). The role of stories in maintaining the status quo in organizations. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Chicago.

Wuthnow, R., Hunter, J.D., Bergesen, A., & Kurzweil, E. (1984). Cultural analysis: The work of Peter L. Berger, Mary Douglas, Michel Foucault, and Jurgen Habermas. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Zey-Ferrell, M. (1981). Introduction to critiques of dominant perspectives. In M. Zey-Ferrell & M. Aiken (Eds.), Complex organizations: Critical perspectives. Glenview, Ill.: Scott Foresman, 1-21.

Zey-Ferrell, M. (1982). Criticisms of the dominant perspective on organizations. In P.O. Berg & P. Daudi (Eds.), Trends and traditions in organization theory, Vol. 2. Lund: Studentlitteratur, 430-475.

Zimmermann, S. & Seibert, J. H. (1986). God's line is never busy: An examination of stories, metaphors, and images in two southern Appalachian churches. Unpublished research paper, Department of Communication, University of Kentucky.